

do it in a fashion that they could afford. We are going to run independents out of business if we do not do something legislatively to fix this problem. That would have been the second thing that could have been recommended and should have been recommended.

The third is to have recommended some type of broad-based royalty reform to encourage exploration and production in difficult areas where it is more expensive to find oil, where many times a day it costs more to explore than it would pay them if they found a producing well, because the price of oil per barrel, partly because of cheap foreign imports, is less than it costs to find that oil. Broad-based royalty relief would have made a major impact on helping to increase domestic production. But there is no recommendation for that type of activity.

The fourth is to do something about the Alaska export ban on oil that is produced in Alaska. When Congress passed that law saying that oil that is found in Alaska could never be exported outside the United States, it probably made sense at that time. But it does not make sense today.

If oil from Alaska can be sold in other areas at a higher price, it would give companies greater amounts of money to explore for and find additional fields domestically in North America—in Alaska, in the gulf coast area—which would increase the domestic production and thereby lower that 50 percent import figure that we have.

Mr. President, not one of those proposals, not one of those initiatives is found in the Commerce Department's finding and recommendation as to what should be done.

I will just close by saying that it is insufficient, in my opinion, for a department of our Government to make a finding that there is a national security threat to this Nation, which they have made, and then to say we are not going to recommend anything new to address that threat. That is an abdication of responsibility. It is unacceptable. This Member, and I know other Members, will take their finding and offer constructive suggestions to, in fact, address what is now clearly established as a national security threat to the United States of America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION.

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I will be very brief so that colleagues will know

that we can end the day, especially the desk staff will know that they can get home to their loved ones.

I did want to bring to the attention of my colleagues that yesterday in the Budget Committee, when Secretary Christopher was there, inadvertently a Republican staff document was attached to part of his testimony and was handed out. I might say that it is a very interesting document. The document that has been prepared by the majority on the Budget Committee shows function 150, International Affairs. It is headlined, "Fiscal Year 1996 Balanced Budget Resolution." Down in the corner it says, "For Internal Purposes Only." But it was handed out inadvertently.

What I think is interesting about this document is it suggests that the majority has a plan to move towards a balanced budget, and I commend them for that. I hope they do have a plan. But I would say to my colleagues that if they have a plan, then we should revisit the question of the right to know provision that we sought to add to the balanced budget amendment.

We sought to add a provision that called on the Republican majority to produce their plan on how they intended to balance the budget so that the States could be advised of that before they had to vote to ratify it, and so that our colleagues who are about to vote on a balanced budget amendment could know what was the outline of the plan.

The Republican majority resisted that right-to-know effort by saying they could not say what a long-term plan was because there were so many things, it would be hard to determine and hard to project and hard to forecast. And yet we find in this document, which was released inadvertently, that at least with respect to one function of the budget they do have a detailed plan, very specific as to what they have in mind; terminating a set of programs, reducing other programs in order to reduce the 150 function, which, of course, is the international affairs function.

This suggests at the very least that other functions for other areas have a plan, something that is in the works, something that is available, that could provide some guidance as to where the majority is going with respect to a plan to balance the budget over the next 7 years.

I would just say to my colleagues that if in fact there are plans for other functional areas, as there clearly is for the international affairs section, we ought to have a chance to see it. We ought to have a chance before we vote on a balanced budget amendment. The American people ought to have a chance to see what the plan is.

What does the Republican majority have in mind for how they intend to balance this budget? I think that would certainly influence some votes in this debate.

Let me just say that I am one Member who is undecided on the question of

how I will vote on a balanced budget amendment. I am not being coy. I am seriously undecided at this point. I want to see what is the final provision on which we will vote.

Let me just add that I am absolutely convinced we must balance the budget in the next 7 years. It is absolutely imperative that we do so. Whether we have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution or not, this Senator believes we have to balance the budget because we have a window of opportunity here before the baby boomers retire, at which time Government spending will skyrocket. And that will put enormous pressure on the economy of this country.

So we have a chance here in the next 7 years to get our fiscal house in order. That must be done. But I have reservations about the elements of this constitutional amendment in terms of the provision that would provide for looting the Social Security trust fund in order to balance the operating budget, the involvement of courts. The last thing I wish to see happening is the Supreme Court of the United States writing the budget of the United States. No judge was ever elected to do that.

I am also concerned about the lack of a capital budget. The vast majority of States that have a balanced budget requirement provide for a capital budget. You can pay for big investments over a period of time. That is what State governments do. That is what we do in our own personal lives. I know very few people who buy a house for cash. Most people take out a mortgage.

So those are, I think, legitimate concerns. But beyond that, I think we also have the question of how we do it. How do we balance the budget? And if our Republican colleagues, in fact, have a plan, one that they have not released and not revealed—and I think the fact that they clearly have one with respect to one function of the budget suggests they probably have it for other functions of the budget—that is something that could form the basis for an important discussion and debate about how we accomplish a balanced budget.

Let me just conclude by saying I would very much like to see us structure a means to require both sides to put down a plan to balance this budget simultaneously.

What is going on is we have a bit of Alphonse and Gaston, the chicken and the egg; nobody wants to go first. And I am working on legislation now that would require us, if the balanced budget amendment fails, to have the budget committees of both Houses and the President put down a plan to balance the budget over the next 7 years and to lay it down by May 1—have both sides be required to come to the table and lay down their plans to balance the budget. It is clear to me now the Republican majority is working on such a plan. Perhaps they have one completed, at least in preliminary outline. I think it would be very important for that to be shared with our colleagues and with

the rest of the country as we consider this very important matter of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I was sworn in as a Member of this body on January 7, as I recall, 1959, the 1,579th Member to have been elected or appointed to the Senate since its beginning on March 4, 1789. As of today, 1,826 men and women have borne the title of United States Senator. When I came to the Senate, some of the other Members were Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico, Styles Bridges of New Hampshire, Paul Douglas of Illinois, Allen Ellender of Louisiana, Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, Lyndon Johnson of Texas, Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, Richard Russell of Georgia, Lister Hill of Alabama, George Aiken of Vermont, Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois, Carl Hayden of Arizona, Wayne Morse of Oregon, Harry Flood Byrd, Sr. of Virginia, Spessard Holland of Florida, Henry Jackson of Washington, John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, William Langer of North Dakota, Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, and others, including J. William Fulbright of Arkansas.

All of these men have now passed from this earthly stage and gone on to their eternal reward. The last of these whom I have mentioned, Bill Fulbright, died last week.

J. William Fulbright was born in Sumner, MO, on April 9, 1905, and moved with his parents to Fayetteville, AR, the following year. He attended the public schools in Arkansas and graduated from the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville in 1925; as a Rhodes Scholar from Oxford University, England, in 1928, and from the Law Department of George Washington University, here in Washington, DC, in 1934. He was admitted to the District of Columbia Bar in 1934, and served as an attorney in the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, in 1934-1935. He was an instructor in law at the George Washington University in 1935, and he was a lecturer in law at the University of Arkansas during the years 1936-1939. He served as President of the University of Arkansas from 1939 to 1941. He was engaged in the newspaper business, in the lumber business, in banking, and in farming, and was elected as a Democrat to the 78th Congress, where he served from January 3, 1943, to January 3, 1945. He was not a candidate for renomination to the House, but was elected to the United States

Senate in 1944, and re-elected in 1950, 1956, 1962, and in 1968, where he served until his resignation on December 31, 1974. He was an unsuccessful candidate for renomination in 1974. He served on the Committee on Banking and Currency in the Senate and on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Bill Fulbright was an outstanding Senator. He served with many other outstanding Senators, some of whom I have named as having ended their sojourn in this early life, and there were other extraordinary men such as John Pastore of Rhode Island, Mike Mansfield of Montana, and Russell Long of Louisiana, all of whom are still among the living. But I have taken the floor today to say that one by one, the old landmarks of our political life have passed away. One by one, the links which connect the glorious past with the present have been sundered.

"Passing away!

'Tis told by the leaf which chill autumn breeze,

Tears ruthlessly its hold from wind-shaken trees;

'Tis told by the dewdrop which sparkles at morn,

And when the noon cometh

'Tis gone, ever gone."

It was my pleasure to serve with Senator Fulbright. I always held him in the highest esteem. He was a gentleman with great courage and unwavering patriotism, a wise and courageous statesman, affable in his temperament, and regarded as one of the outstanding lawyers in the Senate and one of the best informed upon questions regarding international affairs. He was both morally and intellectually honest, simple in his habits, and devoid of all hypocrisy and deceit. He never resorted to the tricks of a demagog to gain favor and, although he was a partisan Democrat, he divested himself of partisanship when it came to serving the best interests of his country. Peace to his ashes!

The potentates on whom men gaze

When once their rule has reached its goal,

Die into darkness with their days.

But monarchs of the mind and soul,

With light unfailing, and unspent,

Illumine flame's firmament.

Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and other great Grecian and Roman philosophers, by pure reason and logic arrived at the conclusion that there is a creating, directing, and controlling divine power, and to a belief in the immortality of the human soul. Throughout the ages, all races and all peoples have instinctively so believed. It is the basis of all religions, be they heathen, Mohammedan, Hebrew, or Christian. It is believed by savage tribes and by semi-civilized and civilized nations, by those who believe in many gods and by those who believe in one God. Agnostics and atheists are, and always have been, few in number. Does the spirit of man live after it has separated from the flesh? This is an age-old question. We are told in the Bible that when God created man from the dust of the ground, "He breathed into his nostrils

the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

When the serpent tempted Eve, and induced her to eat of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge, he said to her, "ye shall not surely die."

Job asked the question, "If a man die, shall he live again?" Job later answered the question by saying, "Oh, that my words were written and engraved with an iron pen upon a ledge of rock forever, for I know that my redeemer liveth and someday He shall stand upon the Earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins"—meaning my heart, my kidneys, my bodily organs—"be consumed within me."

Scientists cannot create matter or life. They can mould and develop both, but they cannot call them into being. They are compelled to admit the truth uttered by the English poet Samuel Roberts, when he said:

"That very power that molds a tear

And bids it trickle from its source,

That power maintains the earth a sphere

And guides the planets in their course."

That power is one of the laws—one of the immutable laws, the eternal laws—of God, put into force at the creation of the universe. From the beginning of recorded time to the present day, most scientists have believed in a divine creator. I have often asked physicians, "Doctor, with your knowledge of the marvelous intricacies of the human body and mind, do you believe that there is a God?" Not one physician has ever answered, "No." Each has answered, readily and without hesitation, "Yes." Some may have doubted some of the tenets of the theology of orthodoxy, but they do not deny the existence of a creator. Science is the handmaiden of true religion, and confirms our belief in the Creator and in immortality.

"Whoever plants a seed beneath the sod
And waits to see it break away the clod
Believes in God."

Mr. President, as Longfellow said, "It is not all of life to live, nor all of death to die." Rather, as Longfellow says:

"There is no death! What seems so is transition;

This life of mortal breath

Is but a suburb of the life Elysian,

Whose portal we call death."

Mr. President, life is only a narrow isthmus between the boundless oceans of two eternities. All of us who travel that narrow isthmus today, must one day board our little frail barque and hoist its white sails for the journey on that vast unknown sea where we shall sail alone into the boundless ocean of eternity, there to meet our Creator face to face in a land where the rose never withers and the rainbow never fades. To that bourne, from which no traveller ever returns, J. William Fulbright has now gone to be reunited with others who once trod these marble halls, and whose voices once rang in